



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,646	12/02/2005	Glenn William Goodall	51097	7269
38157	7590	05/28/2008		
THE GLIDDEN COMPANY 15885 WEST SPRAGUE ROAD STRONGVILLE, OH 44136				
EXAMINER				
MESH, GENNADIY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/559,646

Applicant(s)

GOODALL ET AL.

Examiner

GENNADIY MESH

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment filed on April 24, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-35 canceled by Applicant. Claims 36-47 newly added.

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 36 - 45 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: in response to Election/Restriction requirement filed on November 9, 2007 Applicant elected Invention of Group I, claims 1 - 10 and 23 - 27 directed to Polymer binder.

New Claims 36-45 directed to different invention as **Coating composition** and were not originally elected.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 36-45 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention : language " wherein the binder polymer is chosen from the

group consisting essentially of " is indefinite, because group is open to indefinite number of any new members. Note, that language of Markush group has to be closed by using phrase "consisting of " - see MPEP 2111.03. In this case, claim language will be understood as " consisting of ".

3. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 47 provides for the use of film forming binder, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

4. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Note, that in interest of compact prosecution Claim 47 will be understood as a process of use of the polymeric binder in coating composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamill (GB 1,039,540 cited in ISR - hereafter International Search Report).

Hamill discloses coating composition (see page 2,lines 20 – 60) comprising binder polymer comprising (see page 2,lines 20 - 60):
at least one polymer, for example styrenic (see page 2, lines 21-30),mixture of polysaccharides and proteins and may not have any starches.
Thus, subject mater of claim 46 and 47 are anticipated by reference.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 24, 2008 regarding claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamill, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants arguments based on following:

5.1. Applicant argue that Hamill discloses coating composition for boards and paper, but not architectural coating composition for buildings and furniture.

In response to this argument note, that a recitation of the intended use - in this case use as architectural coating - of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Because, coating disclosed by Hamill comprising same chemical compounds it is capable to perform same functions - in this case can be used as architectural coating.

For this reason this argument was found unpersuasive.

5.2. Applicant argue that Hamill does not disclose film forming binder polymer compositions containing a mixture of protein and **polysaccharide which is de-starched**.

Note, that argument is irrelevant to language of Claims 46 and 47, because Applicant does not claimed presence of **destarched polysaccharide**. Claim 46 recite that " mixture contains less than 2 wt% of starch " - this limitation meet by reference.

5.3. Applicant argue that " to arrive at the combination of protein and polysaccharide, it is necessary to make a selection from no fewer than 10 lists of alternative components and a selection of that complexity is not sufficient to anticipate or destroy the novelty of the Applicant's new Claims".

This argument was found not persuasive, because it is not only clear from description that composition may comprise both protein and polysaccharide, but also claims 7 and 8 directed to composition contained protein and polysaccharide - for this reason ordinary of skill in the art does not need made selection from long list of compounds.

Therefore, all Applicants arguments were found not persuasive.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GENNADIY MESH whose telephone number is (571)272-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m - 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272 1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1796

Gennadiy Mesh
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

/GM/

/VASUDEVAN S. JAGANNATHAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796